



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,290	06/23/2003	Denis Gabriel Valois	10196-00308	6380

7590 05/24/2007
STANLEY MARCUS & ASSOCIATES PLLC
1455 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.
SUITE 100
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,290

Applicant(s)

VALOIS ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R. Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 64-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 64-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Claims 64-72 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 1-63 and 73-79 are cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant has elected group IV: Claims 64-72, classified in class 709, subclass 224 with traverse.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 64, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 64 uses the term 'substantially' to define 'all partial or totally inconsistencies or redundancies with an ACL. There appears to be a missing comma in this line as well.

Claims 70 and 71 use 'substantially' to qualify whether the output is pass or fail.

The word 'substantially' is indefinite. It does not accurately define the claim limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2155

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 64-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,826,698 by Minkin et al.

Regarding claim 64, a computer readable media encoding instructions for detecting substantially all partial or total inconsistencies or redundancies within an access control list (Minkin: col. 5, lines 41-49), said media including instructions for:

- (a) accessing one or more access control list rules (Minkin: col. 5, lines 1-9);
- (b) accessing at least one permission flag for each rule (Minkin: col. 5, lines 18-40);
- (c) modeling each rule geometrically in accordance with an associated permission flag (Minkin: col. 3, lines 1-9; col. 12, lines 36-55);
- (d) detecting an area of intersection of one or more geometric models of the access control list rules (Minkin: col. 13, lines 1-9; col. 18, line 30-33); and
- (e) generating an output based on the intersection of one or more geometric models (Minkin: col. 17, lines 15-34).

Regarding claim 65, the media of claim 64, further including an instruction for tagging each permission flag as either permit or deny (Minkin: col. 7, lines 31-44).

Regarding claim 66, the media of claim 64, further including an instruction for multi-dimensional modeling of each geometric figure in the modeling step (Minkin: col. 12, line 36-55; two dimensional).

Regarding claim 67, the media of claim 64, further including an instruction for employing at least one of a circle, rectangle and solid as a geometric figure in the modeling step (Figs. 7 and 8; geometric figures are shown).

Regarding claim 68, the media of claim 64, further including an instruction of incorporating a status of said permission flag in the modeling step (Fig. 7; the rule set; Fig. 13).

Regarding claim 69, the media of claim 64, having said output comprise pass or fail (Minkin: col. 8, lines 39-50; fail).

Regarding claim 70, the media of claim 64, wherein a pass output result is indicative of substantially no intersecting figures (Minkin: col. 3, lines 9-14; no contradictions).

Regarding claim 71, the media of claim 64, wherein a fail output result is indicative of an existence of substantially all partial or total ACL redundancies or inconsistencies (Minkin: col. 8, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 72, the media of claim 64, having said output comprise optimization of an ACL (Minkin: col. 2, lines 31-33; col. 18, lines 12-38).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 6,651,096 by Gai et al teaches evaluationg ACLs with a transofmration engine that converts them into a Binary Decision diagram (Fig. 8 and 13; col. 6, lines 36-51).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2155

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and after final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the examiner whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

bob


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER